JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

AMOUNT

RECEIPT#

Case 2:19-cv-02791-MAK Document 1 Filed 06/26/19 Page 1 of 11 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil de					974, is require	a for the use of	the Clerk of Co	urt for th	е
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
Allstate Insurance Company a/s/o Kevin Brown				Peco Energy Company					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Cook County, IL (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	(IN U.S. PLA	UNTIFF CASES (Philadelphia ONLY) THE LOCATION C	•	, PA
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Joseph L. McGlynn de Luca Levine LLC 215- Three Valley Square, Sui	310-4731	,		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O.	ne Box Only)	II. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL	PARTIES	(Place an "X" in (One Box fo	r Plaintii
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)		((For Diversity Cases Only) P7 en of This State	rf def	Incorporated or Proof Business In	and One Box for		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and of Business In		3 5	5
				en or Subject of a	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		1 6	<u> </u>
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	FC	PRFEITURE/PENALTY		ere for: Nature	of Suit Code Des	minimum per meriman per	the Common of th
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 2 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 5550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	74: 75	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appeal 423 Withdr 28 USG PROPERI 820 Copyrig 830 Patent New D 840 Trader 862 Black I 863 DIWC/ 864 SSID T 865 RSI (40 FEDERAI 870 Taxes (28 USC 158 awal C 157 YRIGHTS ghts Abbreviated rug Application ark ECURITY 395ff) DIWW (405(g)) Citle XVI 15(g)) TAX SUITS U.S. Plaintiff endant) Chird Party	375 False Cla 376 Qui Tam 3729(a)) 400 State Rea 410 Antitrust 430 Banks an 450 Commer 460 Deportat 470 Racketec Corrupt (nims Act (31 USC) apportion d Banking ce ion r Influence Organizati er Credit t TV s/Commode entutory Act ural Acts cental Matt of Inform on arative Pro- eew or App Decision ionality of	ed and ons dities/ tions ers ation
	noved from 🗇 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reins Reop	stated or	r District	J 6 Multidist Litigation Transfer	n e	Multidist Litigation Direct Fil	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 28 U.S.C. §1332(Brief description of ca	a)(1) 28 U.S.C. §139 use:	91(d)	o not cite jurisdictional stat	ates unless dive	rsity):			
Subrogation Matter involving Propert VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: □ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv,P.			Di	EMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: 180,357.41 JURY DEMAND: X Yes No			ıt:		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				NUMBER	, , , , , ,		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	7	SIGNATURE OF ATTO							

APPLYING 1FP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

Case 2:19-cv-02791-MAKITED GRUPE OF 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

radios of ramidir.	5 Sanders Road Northbrook, I					
Address of Defendant: 23	301 Market Street Philadelphia	a, PA 19010				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 815 Williams Lane, Chadds Ford, PA 19317						
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:						
Case Number: Jud	ge:	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to an	y of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier repreviously terminated action in this court?	Yes No 🗸					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No Vol Ver No No No Ver No No No No No No No No No N						
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?						
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No Verification of the same individual?						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.						
DATE: 6/26/19	Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff	201181 Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)				
CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)						
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Ot 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):	2. Airplane Person 3. Assault, Defama 4. Marine Persona 5. Motor Vehicle F 6. Other Personal I 7. Products Liabili 8. Products Liabili 9. All other Divers (Please specify):	ract and Other Contracts nal Injury ation Il Injury Personal Injury Injury (Please specify): ity Asbestos sity Cases				
	ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION certification is to remove the case from eligibility	for arbitration.)				
I,Joseph L. McGlynn, counsel	of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:					
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of inter	t to the best of my knowledge and belief, the deest and costs:	damages recoverable in this civil action case				
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.						
DATE: 6/26/19	1mas	201181				
	Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff	Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)				

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

.

CIVIL ACTION

Allstate Insurance Company a/s/o

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				
215-310-4731	215-383-0082	jmcglynn@delucalevine	.com			
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for				
6/26/19	Much M.					
(f) Standard Management -	- Cases that do not fall into an	y one of the other tracks.	(X)			
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involve exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for personal injury	or property damage from	()			
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MANA	GEMENT TRACKS:				
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other pa	ase Management Track Design we a copy on all defendants. (So event that a defendant does n shall, with its first appearance	Reduction Plan of this court, court action Form in all civil cases at the see § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the stot agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and seek Designation Form specifying the ned.	time of reverse ng said erve on			
Peco Energy Compar	ny :	NO.				
Kevin Brown v.	*					

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY

a/s/o KEVIN BROWN

2775 Sanders Road Northbrook, Illinois 60062

Civil Action No:

Plaintiff(s),

JURY DEMAND

V.

PECO ENERGY COMPANY

2301 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19010

Defendant(s).

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Allstate Insurance Company a/s/o Kevin Brown, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby demands judgement against defendant, and complains against it as follows:

PARTIES

- 1. Allstate Insurance Company (hereinafter "subrogee" and/or "Allstate") is an Illinois corporation engaged, at all times relevant hereto, in the business of providing property insurance.
- 2. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff provided property insurance to Kevin Brown (hereinafter "subrogors" or "Mr. Brown") owners of the property at 815 Williams Lane, Chadds Ford, PA 19317 (hereinafter the "subject property") under a policy of insurance that was in full force and effect on all relevant dates and at all relevant times.
- 3. In the wake of the incident described below, and as a result of a claim made on said policy, which was duly paid pursuant thereto, Allstate became subrogated to certain recovery rights and interests of Kevin Brown for monies paid thereunder, including the claims giving rise to the within cause of action.

4. Defendant PECO Energy Company (hereinafter "PECO"), is, upon information and belief, a Pennsylvania corporation, with a principal place of business at the above-captioned address. At all times relevant hereto, PECO was engaged in, *inter alia*, the business of providing electrical utility services and sales of electricity.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. Jurisdiction is based on 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1) as this action involves a controversy between entities and/or citizens of different states. Moreover, the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold of this Court (exclusive of interest and costs).
- 6. Venue is proper in this district based on 28 U.S.C. §1391(d) in that the defendant is a resident who regularly conduct business in this district and is subject to personal jurisdiction.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 7. Plaintiff repeats the allegations set forth in the prior paragraphs of this Complaint as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 8. Days before November 6, 2018, a power outage occurred in Mr. Brown's surrounding neighborhood after a fallen tree downed a power line. The resulting electrical event destroyed various appliances within the home of Mr. Brown (as well as PECO's own equipment). Neighbors also reported damage to their electrical meters as a result.
- 9. Even though there existed direct evidence of electrical failures which occurred in Mr. Brown's home and the meter outside, PECO restored power without first ensuring they could safely deliver electricity or that the electrical facilities were sound.
- 10. On November 6, 2018, a fire erupted at the subject property after power was restored. It was later determined that the fire was the result of an arcing failure which occurred between the energized bus and the grounded back of the electrical panel at the subject property.

- 11. Subsequent investigation revealed that the initial electrical event had damaged the components between the electrical meter and electrical panel (i.e. insulation), which allowed carbon tracking to occur. This condition permitted a current to flow from the energized bus to the grounded back of the panel.
- 12. As the current flowed, additional carbon was formed and the current increased until an arc occurred between the energized bus and the grounded back of the panel. This arc then ignited the wooden board to which the main breaker panel was mounted and the fire expanded upwards into the wiring and the wall of the home above to cause this loss.
- 13. PECO was responsible for the safe delivery of electricity to its customers. PECO's carless acts and/or omissions caused and/or substantially contributed to the cause of the damages sustained by Plaintiff as herein complained.

COUNT I – STRICT LIABILITY PLAINTIFF VS. PECO ENERGY COMPANY

- 14. Plaintiff repeats the allegations set forth in the prior paragraphs of this Complaint as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 15. PECO is engaged, and at all times relevant hereto was engaged, in the business of inter alia, marketing, manufacturing, selling, servicing, warranting, and distributing electrical utility services and sales of electricity, including utility services and sales of electricity involved here, to consumers such as Mr. Brown.
- 16. The electrical utility services were not modified, changed, altered, misused, or abused after PECO placed the product into the stream of commerce.
- 17. PECO knew, and intended, that the electrical utility services would be used by members of the general public, and furthermore knew of the specific uses, purposes and requirements for which said product would be utilized.

- 18. PECO distributed and/or sold the electricity in a defective condition, unreasonably dangerous to Plaintiff and his property, which ultimately led to a catastrophic failure and/or malfunction.
- 19. PECO knew or should have known that the electrical services would, and did, reach Mr. Brown without substantial change from the condition in which originally sold.
- 20. Mr. Brown, who was an ordinary consumer, never expected the electrical services would be unsafe or unreasonably dangerous.
 - 21. The aforementioned defects consisted of:
 - a. design defects;
 - b. inadequate safeguards and protections;
 - c. component defects;
 - d. a failure to warn of the above defects; and/or
 - e. a failure to properly instruct as to the appropriate installation, operating and maintenance procedures for safe use of the electricity.
- 22. The defective electricity passed through Mr. Brown's meter before causing the fire inside his home. It was later revealed that Mr. Brown's meter was also damaged.
- 23. For these reasons, PECO is strictly liable to Plaintiff for damage under Section 402 of the Restatement (2d) of Torts, and the applicable case law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 24. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned defects, Plaintiff sustained and incurred damage and harm as described above, in the amount of \$180,357.41.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment against Defendant PECO Energy Company, in an amount of \$180,357.41, plus costs incident to this suit, delay damages and attorney

fees, and for such other relief as this Honorable Court shall deem appropriate under the circumstances.

COUNT II - NEGLIGENCE PLAINTIFF VS. PECO ENERGY COMPANY

- 25. Plaintiff repeats the allegations set forth in the prior paragraphs of this Complaint as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 26. The aforementioned damages were the direct and proximate result of the negligence, carelessness of PECO, by and through its employees, agents, technicians, and/or servants, more specifically described as follows:
 - a. failing to exercise reasonable care in the following manner:
 - i. failing to properly inspect, service and/or keep safe the equipment required for the delivery of electricity to Mr. Brown's property;
 - failing to properly ensure that the electrical facilities were safe including the connections from the electrical meter to the Mr. Brown's electrical panel was safe and compliant with the National Electric Code (NEC), National Electrical Safety Code (NESC);
 - iii. failure in its duty of care (the highest degree of care under the law) to Mr. Brown, when it failed to properly maintain its distribution system from damage by trees as required by Section 218 of the National Electrical Safety Code;
 - iv. failure in its duty of care to Mr. Brown by restoring electric service without inspecting or causing to have inspected the electric panel, the connections between the meter and electrical panel, and the structure wiring which was damaged by the initial electrical event;
 - failing to properly protect its customer, Mr. Brown, from an unsafe and dangerous condition of an improperly installed electrical line of which PECO was on notice;
 - vi. failing to properly determine that the electrical facilities at Mr. Brown's property were not in compliance with the standards set forth in subparagraph (ii) so as to prevent the fire and damages;

- vii. failing to properly prevent the fire by installing adequate protection in the event of a fault:
- viii. failing to properly perform preventative maintenance, timely replacement or repair of the electrical line to Mr. Brown's property; and
- ix. failing to properly warn or inform Mr. Brown of the need to inspect the electric panel, the connections between the meter and electrical panel, and the structure wiring when they knew or should have known of the dangerous condition
- b. failing to adequately instruct and supervise its employees, representatives, technician's and/or agents so as to avoid the problems set forth in subparagraph (a) above;
- c. failing to adequately warn Mr. Brown and others of the dangers and hazardous conditions resulting from the careless and negligent conduct set forth in subparagraph (a) above;
- d. failing to provide, establish, and/or follow proper and adequate control so as to avoid the problems enumerated in subparagraph (a) above; and/or
- e. failing to perform the services set forth in subparagraph (a) above in conformity with the prevailing industry and governmental specifications, standards, and laws, including, but not limited to, the National Electric Code (NEC), National Electrical Safety Code (NESC).
- 27. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of PECO, the insured sustained and incurred damage to his real and personal property, as well as the imposition of additional expenses and hardships, in an amount well in the amount of \$180,357.41.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment against Defendant PECO Energy Company, in an amount of \$180,357.41, plus costs incident to this suit, delay damages and attorney fees, and for such other relief as this Honorable Court shall deem appropriate under the circumstances.

COUNT III - BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY
OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE
PLAINTIFF VS. PECO ENERGY COMPANY

- 28. Plaintiff repeats the allegations set forth in the prior paragraphs of this Complaint as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 29. In conjunction with the sale and distribution of electricity, PECO expressly and implicitly warranted that it would be free from defects, merchantable and safe to use for its general and intended purposes.
- 30. At the time of contracting for the sale and/or distribution of the electricity, PECO had reason to know the particular purpose to which the electricity would be used and knew that its skill and judgment was being relied upon to furnish a suitable product. Thus, PECO breached the implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose as set out in the Uniform Commercial Code (hereinafter "UCC") 13 Pa.C.S.A. §2-315 in that the subject product was not fit for the particular purpose for which such products are required.
- 31. In addition, PECO breached its implied warranty of merchantability as set out in 13 Pa.C.S.A.§ 2-314(c) in that the subject product was not fit for the ordinary uses for which the subject product was used.
- 32. In addition, PECO breached any and all express warranties made or relating to the subject property that became part of the basis of the bargain for sale of the product in derogation of 13 Pa.C.S.A.§2-313.
- 33. Plaintiff's damages occurred as a direct and proximate result of PECO's breach of its implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose and merchantability as set out in 13 Pa.C.S.A.§2-315 and §2-314(c) as a result of PECO's breach of their expressed warranties in derogation of 13 Pa.C.S.A.§2-313.

34. Based upon the above, PECO breached these implied and/or statutory warranties.

as well as express warranties provided with the product.

35. As a direct and proximate result of such breach(es), Mr. Brown sustained and

incurred damage to personal property, as well as the imposition of additional expenses and

hardship, in the amount of \$180,357.41.

36. Plaintiff had and has performed all conditions precedent to recover based upon such

breaches.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment against Defendant PECO Energy

Company, in an amount of \$180,357.41, plus costs incident to this suit, delay damages and attorney

fees, and for such other relief as this Honorable Court shall deem appropriate under the

circumstances.

de LUCA LEVINE LLC

JOSEPH L. MCGLYNN, ESQUIRE

PA ID: 201181

Three Valley Square, Suite 220

Blue Bell, PA 19422

215-383-0081

215-383-0082 (fax)

jmcglynn@delucalevine.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Dated: June 26, 2019